

Peer-review report of

Titzmann, P. F., & Jugert, P. (2024). The dynamics of acculturative change: The potential of a developmental perspective in acculturation science. *advances.in/psychology*, 2, e553629. <https://doi.org/10.56296/aip00029>

Round 1

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your comprehensive review to our special issue. We are delighted to have received the evaluations of two highly respected experts in the field, and we have also carefully read your manuscript ourselves before consulting their reviews.

We all agree that your work has many strengths. The topic is undoubtedly well-suited for the special issue, and your review provides a thorough examination that will significantly contribute to the integration of developmental and acculturation science. You cover a wide range of ground and generally express your thoughts clearly and concisely.

However, both reviewers have identified valuable areas for improvement. For example, they suggest that you consider and clarify the target population that your review focuses on. They also recommend providing more insights into the decisions that guided the content and structure of your review, as well as offering the reader a roadmap early on. Reviewer 2 has also provided valuable input on literature that is relevant to your review and should be cited accordingly. Both reviewers have additional comments that we won't repeat here, but we kindly ask you to address each one carefully. In your revision letter, please provide an itemized overview that explains your changes and provides examples of them.

In addition to the reviewers' comments, we would like to request the following changes. Given the comprehensive nature of your review, it would be beneficial to include a table or a figure that provides an overview of the different frameworks and their potential for productive application in acculturation research. For instance, you could create a table that organizes the theoretical frameworks as rows, with column 1 describing each framework, column 2 outlining its relevance for acculturation research, and column 3 offering concrete research recommendations based on each framework. This will function as a pedagogical tool to effectively communicate the essence of your content to various groups of readers and increase the overall impact.

Regarding the minor typos one of the reviewers mentioned, please carefully review your manuscript and correct any typographical or grammatical errors before resubmitting. For instance, the heading on page 5 needs to be corrected.

It will be good to reference some claims made in the paper, e.g., “A substantial amount of acculturation research, however, does not address this question, instead variable-oriented rather static personality science models dominate” (page 8)

Also, in in Table 1, what is meant by “no change rates in a specific process become very small in longitudinal studies”?

Please provide a reference for “Complex Dynamic Systems” when it is first referred to.

“...showing that while overall academic achievement decreased across three years of secondary school among both immigrant- and non-immigrant adolescents, this decrease was less marked among students attending more adverse classrooms” Do you mean “diverse” instead of “adverse?”

Regarding the Identity Project as an example of an effective intervention, while the project's experimental approach is commendable, results may be less promising than you convey. For instance, UmañaTaylor, Kornienko, et al. (2018) who you cite did not seem to find any direct effect on adjustment. Instead, they relied on 5 (!) stage mediation models without controls for auto-regression and without differentiating between and within-group change (which you argued for) to indirectly connect the intervention with adaptation outcomes. Maybe there is research we are missing, but it would be good to be realistic with regards to these results, especially as the studies do not seem to have been pre-registered and the analytic approach allows for a high researcher degree of freedom.

We hope this feedback will be helpful in revising your important work. We look forward to receiving your revision by September 30. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you should require more time.

Best,

Jonas R. Kunst & David L. Sam

Reviewer 1:

Thanks for the opportunity to review this work. It was well conceptualised and written with high levels of clarity, balance and insight. My comments are relatively minor and I want to highlight that I consider the manuscript to be an important contribution to the knowledge overall.

1. The authors grapple with a topic that has been theoretically neglected in the research, but subject to many discrete attempts at integration. Therefore, while it is clear that the manuscript is a review at all stages, it is not clear how decisions were made about the inclusion of topics in the review. It is not expected that a complete method section is added, but to assist the reader in understanding the scope and limitations of the work, this should be more clearly outlined.
2. The discussion tends to be focused toward how acculturation research can benefit from developmental science - which is understandable given the focus of the special issue. However, there is a growing trend in developmental research to simply apply acculturation frameworks or variables without a clear understanding of the process / change oriented underpinning as well. This leads to poor science on both sides and I feel it should be better reflected, at least in the introduction and discussion. How can developmental science learn from acculturation is of interest even if it is not the main focus of the manuscript. I do see this is noted briefly in the conclusion, but it could be more evident. Maybe what is implicit here is that Developmental Science does better modelling of change, however, both fields often fail to account for the complex interrelationships between “normative” and cultural or sociocultural changes.
3. Furthermore, starting off the section acculturative developmental process with “immigrant youth” sets the scene for neglecting the important developmental processes of enculturation / acculturation / socialisation that happen for young people exposed to multiple cultural orientations that are not immigrant youth (2nd or later gen, Indigenous, mixed culture, and even majority youth in multicultural contexts). The term “minoritized” is used in the section later on and it might be more appropriate to unpack this to better highlight cultural developmental issues for all types of minority young people as well as those exposed to multiple cultural orientations within and outside of the home. Also while the school setting is an important one to highlight examples of the essentialisation of cultural groups, this section could have been broader as per my comments here as well as potentially touch on family contexts. I was quite surprised to see that there were actually very few places that touched on family relationships in the manuscript. An exception is page 13, although this could have also been covered in more detail.
4. I appreciate that the authors mention life-span developmental approaches, but this should be included when discussing why the integration of approaches is important, instead of a focus on immigrant youth more specifically. I would like to see this unpacked a bit more.

5. The life-stage principle and phase transitions sections were well written and compelling. The complexity of this could be highlighted a little more by carefully discussing that it is not just about when a transition happens - because for some the transition happens before they are born. Also, developmental phase transitions happen for adults and are as important as for adolescents (e.g. partnering, having children, retiring). Overall, however, the manuscript seemed to be very much written from an adolescent point of view in the research which did get me thinking whether it might be more accurate to discuss the review as on research in this life stage, which it predominantly is, even though nods are given to life-span issues.
6. Research utilising RI-CLPM models and LCGM have been undertaken within acculturation research with immigrant youth and with refugees and it would be good to highlight some examples of this work beyond the daily diary study of Schwartz and colleagues.
7. The person-in-context section could benefit from a discussion of research on dyadic relationships (parent/child) as well as potentially on social networks in classrooms. This is not solely the realm of multi-level models or nesting effects.
8. Very minor comments. On page 4 there is an error in the words specific, written as “specif9c”. I didn’t come across a large number of errors, but a thorough check is still required. Additionally, I did find at least one citation missing from the reference section - Ward and Szabo, 2019.

Reviewer 2:

This is an interesting manuscript that calls for integration between acculturation and developmental science – and specifically for realizing the developmental potential of acculturation theory and research. Overall, I found the paper to be quite disjointed, in that the arguments were not well organized and there was no introductory “roadmap” paragraph to orient the reader and tell them what to expect. Additionally, although the authors do cite Schwartz et al. (2020), many of the arguments that the authors advance duplicate (or very closely parallel) those advanced by Schwartz et al. I would want to know more about what is new in the paper, while citing Schwartz et al. for concepts such as equifinality. There are also a number of other concepts that are introduced without sufficient attribution to prior work, as I note below. Although there are some new (and quite good) arguments in the present paper, the ideas are not nearly as new as the authors seem to claim that they are.

Some additional points:

If the present article is about adolescents and young adults, that should be noted up front. Currently that is implied but never explicitly stated.

Are the authors' arguments limited to first-generation migrants? Do second-generation migrants also qualify for inclusion within the authors' arguments? What about third culture kids (those who are raised in different places and cannot pinpoint "where they are from")? What are the boundaries around the authors' ideas? To whom do they apply, and to whom do they not apply?

The manuscript states (page 3) that "acculturation processes are assumed to be driven by culture contact, whereas developmental changes can be instigated through myriads of internal biological, external social, or societal factors." Why couldn't it be both? Normative developmental processes will likely not drive acculturation unless there is some intercultural contact going on.

The term "minoritized" is problematic. It carries a victimhood mentality that contradicts the inherent strengths and assets that migrant youth bring with them (see Cobb et al., 2019, *Perspectives on Psychological Science*). Contrary to the pathologizing of immigrants that is common in the literature, the majority of newcomers thrive in their new environments.

The introduction of ethnic homophily seems to come out of nowhere and does not really contribute to the flow of the paper.

The idea of a sensitive period for acculturation was introduced by Cheung, Chudek, and Heine in *Psychological Science* in the early 2010s – that work should be cited in the present paper.

The issue of what initiates change is hugely important. I would love to see the authors expand on this topic.

Additional diary research has been published by Schwartz and colleagues in the last 5-6 years. The authors should consider citing this work in addition to Yip and Civitillo.

In terms of matching assessment schedules to theorized change processes, see Lerner et al. (2009) in *Human Development*. These authors discuss this very issue in that article.

The applicability of phase transitions to migration is brilliant!! Please say more.

The authors should cite Colleen Ward's book on the psychology of culture shock in the section about newly arrived immigrants changing at faster rates.

On the topic of immigrant adolescents being subject to developmental as well as cultural forces, please see Beyhan Ertanir's article in *Research on Child and Adolescent Psychopathology* (December 2023).

Some research has also examined developmental trajectories in parent-youth acculturation discrepancies (Schwartz et al., 2016, *Journal of Research on Adolescence*). And the transition from pubertal timing to acculturation gaps feels rushed and sudden.

The section on differentiating within- and between-person variability in acculturation is good, but again it comes out of nowhere. The structure of the paper needs work so that the ideas flow more evenly.

Some acculturation research has looked at differentiating within-person from between-person variability. Please see Alan Meca's work on this.

Andrik Becht has conducted studies with diary bursts inside of longer-term studies. I would suggest citing his work on page 15 where you suggest these types of designs.

The paper uses a lot of terminology but does not define it – such as acculturative hassles and outgroup orientation.

The focus on intervention studies as an experimental manipulation is very well explained. If intervention studies involve random assignment, then they *are* experimental and *can* be used to test causal hypotheses.

The material on the identity project is good, but it needs to be contextualized within the larger thesis of the paper.

Round 2

Dear Authors,

We are delighted to inform you that your manuscript has thoroughly addressed the points raised in the previous review. The Reviewers were satisfied with the revisions and have only suggested minor, cosmetic changes to the manuscript. We concur with their assessment and believe that your paper has developed into an exceptionally strong contribution with the potential to guide the next generation of acculturation research. As such, we are pleased to accept your manuscript for publication, pending the incorporation of the Reviewers' minor comments (or rebuttals, which you may have) and the following points we have identified:

1. Please integrate the footnotes into the main text to ensure a smooth reading experience.
2. For the Redfield et al. reference, kindly specify in the parenthesis whether you italicized the word "changes" in the quote.
3. In the heading, "Why it is important to integrate acculturative and developmental perspectives?", please invert the order of "it" and "is" given that the sentence is a question.
4. To maintain the cohesiveness of the text, we recommend paraphrasing and summarizing the extensive quote by Granic and Patterson (p. 104).
5. You may consider citing an additional study that failed to demonstrate interindividual changes in prejudice due to contact:
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/19485506241284079>
6. We suggest omitting the mention of stereotype threat from the section on interventions. The literature on stereotype threat has faced substantial criticism, and large-scale replications have called into question the reliability or even the existence of this effect. We believe that, following your revisions, this section is sufficiently robust and does not require this reference.
7. In a separate communication, we will provide you with an annotated document containing suggestions for minor linguistic improvements.

We are confident that these changes can be addressed within a short timeframe. To expedite the publication of your important work, we would greatly appreciate receiving the revised version within two weeks. Once again, we extend our gratitude for submitting this significant contribution to our special issue.

Best regards,

Jonas R. Kunst & David L. Sam

Reviewer 1:

The manuscript is improved from the previous version and the authors have shown critical consideration of all of the comments made by the Editor and reviewers. It is a very nicely written and timely contribution that was a pleasure to review.

I appreciate the way the authors have now introduced the overarching aim of review and I feel like this gives the reader a clear idea of what to expect and the purpose of the work is. I also enjoyed the other additions made – notably the section on longitudinal models is much more comprehensive and the person-in context section now clear and compelling. I have very few comments as I think the manuscript is publishable as it is. Therefore, very minor issues outlined below.

1. A final check is needed for minor errors; e.g., in the abstract "...utilize a developmental science perspective and demonstrates.." should read "*demonstrate*"
2. As the focus is now clearly on immigrant youth this should be highlighted in the abstract.
3. The quotes on page 4 are a bit unclear – I read these as examples from the authors, but putting them into quotes makes them seem as though they are derived from true accounts.
4. I appreciate the definition of the term "ethnic minoritized individuals" that has been added in – but ask would it be more accurate to label this "ethnically minoritized"? Also in the definition "(i.e., individuals who face discrimination and bad treatment due to an assumed membership in another ethnic group)" – I think this should read in *an* ethnic group, not "another"
5. On page 6 the concept of familism my not by understood by all readers – a short description and citation would help
6. Page 8 "depending on the life stage in which these experiences are made.." might be better "experiences *occur*"

Reviewer 2:

The authors have responded to my comments, and I think this paper is ready for publication.

I still, however, object to the word "minoritized." This seems to be a new left-wing buzzword casting people as victims without agency. This framing is largely incorrect based on my 20+ years of studying immigrants of color! Of course there is discrimination, but the vast majority of these people are doing very well. Please change this word.